UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,897 05/17/2006		Joo-Ho Kim	0001.1059	5791
49455 STEIN MCEW	7590 11/05/200 E N, LLP	EXAMINER		
1400 EYE STR SUITE 300		JOHNSON, CONNIE P		
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20005	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/05/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptomail@smiplaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/531,897	KIM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Examino	AILOIIIL	

	CONNIE P. JOHNSON	1795	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original for replacements or repla	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered and amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered and a considered amendment and a cons	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying the	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 4-26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		i be entered and an e.	унапапон от
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Cynthia H Kelly/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that Yamasaki does not teach light to heat converting layers sandwiching the image forming layer wherein the light to heat converting layers form a pattern. Further, applicant argues that the two light to heat conversion layers sandwiching the image forming layer would not have been obvious in Yamasaki because the light to heat conversion layer in Yamasaki provides no benefit and is not even required.

The printing plate of Yamasaki is image forming and capable of forming patterns. Applicant is directed to page 26, paragraph 0282 wherein Yamasaki teaches light to heat converting material in layers other than the imaging layer. The other layers comprising the light to heat converting material include the layer under the imaging layer and the overcoat layer over the imaging layer. Therefore, Yamasaki definitely suggests light to heat converting material in plural layers above and below the imaging layer. With regards to Yamasaki not teaching the benefits of the second light to heat converting layer, Yamasaki teaches the light to heat converting layers improve efficiency and sensitivity. Therefore, one of ordinary skill would use the light to heat converting material in more than one layer to improve efficiency and sensitivity in the imaging composition.

Applicant argues that Yamasaki does not teach creating patterns that require large amounts of heat and also does not teach a photoresist or heat sensitive layer that could evaporate or deform by larger amounts of heat that are not efficiently converted and provided.

Applicant has not claimed any particular limitations of the thermal sensitive layer, therefore the argument about Yamasaki's heat sensitive layer not requiring large amounts of heat or its ability to evaporate or deform is moot.